



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
-----------------	-------------	----------------------	---------------------	------------------

10/519,956

04/15/2005

Fumi Kawai

NGB-37326

7348

116 7590 10/01/2010

PEARNE & GORDON LLP
1801 EAST 9TH STREET
SUITE 1200
CLEVELAND, OH 44114-3108

EXAMINER

FINDLEY, CHRISTOPHER G

ART UNIT

PAPER NUMBER

2621

MAIL DATE

DELIVERY MODE

10/01/2010

PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Office Action Summary	Application No. 10/519,956	Applicant(s) KAWAI, FUMI	
	Examiner CHRISTOPHER FINDLEY	Art Unit 2621	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 17 March 2010.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 13-24 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 13-24 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☒ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☒ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. ☒ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|---|---|
| 1) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413) |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application |
| Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____ | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ |

DETAILED ACTION

Response to Arguments

1. Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 13 and 24 have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

2. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

3. **Claims 13-24 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Elberbaum (US 7171106 B2) in view of Monroe (US 6970183 B1).**

Re **claim 13**, Elberbaum discloses a video generation processing apparatus comprising: a plurality of imaging apparatuses each for picking up a video (Elberbaum: Figs. 1-8, 17, and 19 all show multiple cameras as inputs); video storing means for storing the videos picked up by the plurality of imaging apparatuses and additional information of respective videos (Elberbaum: column 2, lines 37-42, "recording and retrieving video signals generated by a plurality of synchronized video transmitters, each incorporating an individually allotted identification code signal, into and from a digital recorder having at least one main memory storage device for routinely recording the camera signals in endless rotation"; column 2, lines 47-50, "storing the compressed individual signals along with the individual identification code thereof and the time and

Art Unit: 2621

date of the recording in a continuous cycle into at least one main memory storage device to full capacity"); base video retrieving means for retrieving a base video including additional information from the video storing means (Elberbaum: column 3, lines 12-18, video recalled based on identification, time and date of the recording and/or alarm particulars);

Elberbaum does not explicitly disclose related-video condition generating means for generating a related-video condition that relates to the additional information of the base video acquired by the base video retrieving means; and video acquiring means for acquiring at least one related video that meets the related- video condition from the video storing means, wherein the at least one related video that meets the related video condition is output. However, Monroe discloses a multimedia surveillance and monitoring system, wherein multiple cameras may overlap to monitor a location (Monroe: Fig. 48) and the sensors may be synchronized to provide time stamped records of an event from multiple cameras (Monroe: column 6, line 62-column 7, line 4 and column 35, lines 17-19). Monroe also discloses that accessing a video database may include searching by location, room, person, time, sensor type, or any combination of the above (Monroe: column 34, lines 41-55). Furthermore, Monroe discloses that cameras and sensors may be grouped according to an event (Monroe: column 35, lines 37-50), thus indicating that the stored information may be accessed based on the metadata associated with the data from each of the cameras and sensors. Since both Elberbaum and Monroe relate to recording video data and additional metadata information for later retrieval, one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention

Art Unit: 2621

would have found it obvious to incorporate the multiple camera focused on a single event, as disclosed by Monroe, with the monitoring system of Elberbaum in order to provide the most comprehensive coverage of an alarm event, thereby increasing robustness of the system in the event that one camera fails to record an alarm scene (Monroe: column 35, lines 19-22).

Re **claim 14**, Elberbaum discloses that the video generation processing apparatus acquires an imaging position information of the base video from video storing means by using first predetermined conditions that select the base video (Elberbaum: column 14, lines 34-43, location information may be included in the identification code), and generates the related-video condition based on the acquired imaging position information and date/hour information contained in the first predetermined conditions (Elberbaum: column 2, lines 47-50, “storing the compressed individual signals along with the individual identification code thereof and the time and date of the recording in a continuous cycle into at least one main memory storage device to full capacity”).

Re **claim 15**, Elberbaum discloses display processing means for processing the base video and the related video to display simultaneously on one screen (Elberbaum: column 17, lines 4-10, multiple cameras may be selected for split display).

Re **claim 16**, Elberbaum discloses that an imaging apparatus for picking up the related video and an imaging apparatus for picking up the base video are different respectively (Elberbaum: Figs. 1-8, 17, and 19 all show multiple cameras as inputs).

Re **claim 17**, Elberbaum discloses that the related-video condition contains imaging position information and the date/hour information (Elberbaum: column 14,

Art Unit: 2621

lines 34-43, time/date and location information may be included in the identification code).

Re **claim 18**, Elberbaum discloses a majority of the features of claim 18, as discussed above in claim 16, but Elberbaum does not explicitly disclose that the related-video condition contains a position information of neighboring areas adjacent to a position indicated by the imaging position information and the date/hour information. However, Monroe discloses a multimedia surveillance and monitoring system, wherein multiple cameras may overlap to monitor a location (Monroe: Fig. 48) and the sensors may be synchronized to provide time stamped records of an event from multiple cameras (Monroe: column 6, line 62-column 7, line 4 and column 35, lines 17-19). Since both Elberbaum and Monroe relate to recording video data and additional metadata information for later retrieval, one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention would have found it obvious to incorporate the multiple camera focused on a single event, as disclosed by Monroe, with the monitoring system of Elberbaum in order to provide the most comprehensive coverage of an alarm event, thereby increasing robustness of the system in the event that one camera fails to record an alarm scene (Monroe: column 35, lines 19-22).

Re **claim 19**, Elberbaum discloses a majority of the features of claim 19, as discussed above in claim 16, but Elberbaum does not explicitly disclose that the related-video condition contains position information of invisible areas that are not picked up in the base video and date/hour information. However, Monroe discloses a multimedia surveillance and monitoring system, wherein multiple cameras may overlap to monitor a

Art Unit: 2621

location (Monroe: Fig. 48) and the system can map the sensors (Monroe: Fig. 48; column 13, lines 64-65; column 16, lines 14-16), thus indicating on a map areas both within the sensors' field of view and not within the sensors' field of view. Since both Elberbaum and Monroe relate to recording video data and additional metadata information for later retrieval, one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention would have found it obvious to incorporate the multiple camera focused on a single event and sensor mapping, as disclosed by Monroe, with the monitoring system of Elberbaum in order to provide the most comprehensive coverage of an alarm event, thereby allowing flexibility in the user's viewing of the monitored events (Monroe: column 16, lines 14-16).

Re **claim 20**, Elberbaum discloses a majority of the features of claim 20, as discussed above in claim 16, but Elberbaum does not explicitly disclose that the related-video condition generating means acquires imaging position information of video adjacent to the base video in a video feature space to generate the related-video condition. However, Monroe discloses a multimedia surveillance and monitoring system, wherein multiple cameras may overlap to monitor a location (Monroe: Fig. 48) and the sensors may be synchronized to provide time stamped records of an event from multiple cameras (Monroe: column 6, line 62-column 7, line 4 and column 35, lines 17-19). Since both Elberbaum and Monroe relate to recording video data and additional metadata information for later retrieval, one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention would have found it obvious to incorporate the multiple camera focused on a single event, as disclosed by Monroe, with the monitoring system of Elberbaum in order

Art Unit: 2621

to provide the most comprehensive coverage of an alarm event, thereby increasing robustness of the system in the event that one camera fails to record an alarm scene (Monroe: column 35, lines 19-22).

Re **claim 21**, Elberbaum discloses a majority of the features of claim 21, as discussed above in claim 16, but Elberbaum does not explicitly disclose that the related-video condition generating means acquires imaging position information of videos having a relevancy with the base video in meaning contents to generate the related video condition. However, Monroe discloses a multimedia surveillance and monitoring system, wherein multiple cameras may overlap to monitor a location (Monroe: Fig. 48) and the sensors may be synchronized to provide time stamped records of an event from multiple cameras (Monroe: column 6, line 62-column 7, line 4 and column 35, lines 17-19). Since both Elberbaum and Monroe relate to recording video data and additional metadata information for later retrieval, one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention would have found it obvious to incorporate the multiple camera focused on a single event, as disclosed by Monroe, with the monitoring system of Elberbaum in order to provide the most comprehensive coverage of an alarm event, thereby increasing robustness of the system in the event that one camera fails to record an alarm scene (Monroe: column 35, lines 19-22).

Re **claim 22**, Elberbaum discloses that respective videos are ordered in response to a priority rule when the related video contains at least two videos (Elberbaum: column 2, lines 42-44, alarm event data receives priority and is stored in a separate memory).

Re **claim 23**, Elberbaum discloses that the additional information of respective videos stored in the video storing means contain imaging position information, date/hour information, and imaging apparatus information (Elberbaum: column 14, lines 34-43, time/date and location information may be included in the identification code).

Elberbaum does not specifically disclose that a data structure of the video storing means is composed of a two-dimensional arrangement in which a first axis indicates the imaging position information and a second axis indicates the date/hour information and then information of the imaging apparatus that shot a predetermined imaging position at a predetermined date/hour are saved into a cell at which a predetermined imaging position information and a predetermined date/hour information intersect with each other. However, the Examiner takes Official Notice that one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention would have found it obvious that the creation of such a two-dimensional data structure simply matches up stored video clips that include associated metadata with the particular metadata selected by the user. This methodology provides no clear benefit over any other data retrieval scheme, and its inclusion in the system would be an arbitrary decision of the system designer.

Claim 24 recites the corresponding method for implementation by the apparatus of claim 13. The arguments presented for claim 13 are applicable to claim 24, and, therefore, claim 24 has been analyzed and rejected with respect to claim 13 above.

Conclusion

Art Unit: 2621

4. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure:

- a. Video recording apparatus and method, and centralized monitoring recording system; Nishijima et al. (US 7088907 B1)
- b. Video cassette recorder for and method of performing high-speed searching of important information, such as desired time or alarm data; Lee (US 6608962 B1)

Contact

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to CHRISTOPHER FINDLEY whose telephone number is (571)270-1199. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Friday (8:30 AM-5:00 PM).

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Marsha D. Banks-Harold can be reached on 571-272-7905. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Art Unit: 2621

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

/Marsha D. Banks-Harold/ SPE Art Unit 2621

/Christopher Findley/